

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 9, 2007. Claims 1 to 4 remain in the application, of which Claims 1 and 3 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,084,638 (Hare) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,503 (Perkes). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention of Claim 1 is directed to a display apparatus (e.g., a TV monitor). The display apparatus has a remote controller which controls the display apparatus. It also has a display unit, a connecting unit which connects both the display apparatus and an input/output device connected to the display apparatus to an external apparatus, and a control unit which selects one of first and second operating modes based on control data sent from the remote controller. If the control unit selects the first operating mode based on the control data sent from the remote controller, the connecting unit connects both the display apparatus and the input/output device connected to the display apparatus to the external apparatus so as (i) to make the external apparatus recognize the display unit as a monitor of the external apparatus and (ii) to make the external apparatus recognize the input/output device connected to the display apparatus as an input/output device of the external apparatus. However, if the control unit selects the second operating mode based on the control data sent from the remote controller, the connecting unit disconnects both the display apparatus and the input/output device connected to the display apparatus from the external apparatus so as (i) to make the display unit function as a monitor of the display apparatus and (ii) to make the input/output device

connected to the display apparatus function as an input/output device of the display apparatus.

Claim 3 is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art of Hare and Perkes is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 3, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a control unit which selects one of first and second operating modes based on control data sent to the display apparatus from a remote controller, wherein if the control unit selects the first operating mode based on the control data sent from the remote controller, the connecting unit connects both the display apparatus and an input/output device connected to the display apparatus to an external apparatus so as (i) to make the external apparatus recognize the display unit as a monitor of the external apparatus and (ii) to make the external apparatus recognize the input/output device connected to the display apparatus as an input/output device of the external apparatus, and if the control unit selects the second operating mode based on the control data sent from the remote controller, the connecting unit disconnects both the display apparatus and the input/output device connected to the display apparatus from the external apparatus so as (i) to make the display unit function as a monitor of the display apparatus and (ii) to make the input/output device connected to the display apparatus function as an input/output device of the display apparatus.

Hare uses a TV monitor to display an image from a computer 2 and a TV image by changing over a standard television transmission and a related PC generated signal by a TV receiver control device or an interface extender 26. However, it should be noted that a keyboard 27a, a mouse 27b and a joystick 27c are not connected to the PC 2

via the TV receiver 4 but are connected to the PC 2 via user interface 26 and it is a PC 2 to effect such change-over in accordance with a signal from the TV receiver control device or the interface extender 26, as rightly noted in the Office Action. Thus, Hare fails to teach the features of the invention.

Perkes merely teaches the use of a remote controller itself. However, nothing in Perkes makes up for above deficiencies of Hare. Thus, any permissible combination of Hare and Perkes would not have resulted in at least the features of a control unit which selects one of first and second operating modes based on control data sent to the display apparatus from a remote controller, wherein if the control unit selects the first operating mode based on the control data sent from the remote controller, the connecting unit connects both the display apparatus and an input/output device connected to the display apparatus to an external apparatus so as (i) to make the external apparatus recognize the display unit as a monitor of the external apparatus and (ii) to make the external apparatus recognize the input/output device connected to the display apparatus as an input/output device of the external apparatus, and if the control unit selects the second operating mode based on the control data sent from the remote controller, the connecting unit disconnects both the display apparatus and the input/output device connected to the display apparatus from the external apparatus so as (i) to make the display unit function as a monitor of the display apparatus and (ii) to make the input/output device connected to the display apparatus function as an input/output device of the display apparatus.

Accordingly, Claims 1 to 4 are believed to be allowable over Hare and Perkes.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

Applicants respectfully request that, should the Examiner not find the application to be in condition for allowance, that he contact Applicants' undersigned representative to discuss any outstanding issues so as to advance prosecution of this case and place it in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 1421671v1